

Remarks

Claims 1-6, 8-22, and 34-63 were pending in the application. Claims 4, 22, 46, 53, and 56 are amended herein. Claims 21, 45, 51, 52, and 55 are canceled herein without prejudice. Therefore, after entry of this amendment, **claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 34-44, 46-50, 53, 54, and 56-63** are pending.

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Unless specifically stated otherwise, the amendments made herein are not intended to limit the scope of any claim. This filing is appropriate after final rejection because it will not require further search or examination in order for the case to be allowed, it enters suggestions discussed with the Examiner, and/or it places the case in better position for appeal should such become necessary.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for reciting “wherein the the synthetic...” Claim 4 is amended herein to recite “wherein the synthetic homopolymer of γ PGA...” It is believed that this amendment fully addresses the rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Objections

Claims 21, 22, 45, 46, 51-53, 55, and 56 are each objected to as being a substantial duplicate of another pending claim. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree, solely in order to advance prosecution, claims 21, 45, 51, 52, and 55 are canceled herein without prejudice. Therefore the objections to these claims are rendered moot. Applicants traverse the objections to claims 22, 46, 53, and 56, to the extent the objections are maintained in light of the amendments made herewith.

Claim 22 is amended herein to recite “the method of claim 20, further comprising eliciting an immune response against the carrier.” Support for this amendment may be found in the specification, for example, at page 13, lines 29-31. This amendment adds a further step to

the method, and thus, claim 22 as amended is not a substantial duplicate of claim 20. Claim 46 is analogous to claim 22, and is amended similarly herein. This amendment adds a further step to the method, and thus, claim 46 as amended is not a substantial duplicate of claim 44.

Claim 53 is amended herein to recite “wherein the immune response against the *Bacillus* antigenic epitope in the subject comprises IgG anti- *B. anthracis* γ PGA antibodies, and further comprising eliciting an immune response against the carrier in the subject, wherein the immune response against the carrier comprises IgG anti-carrier antibodies.” Support for this amendment may be found in the specification, for example, at page 13, lines 29-31; page 35, Table 1; and page 37, lines 11-15. This amendment further limits the type of immune response elicited (IgG antibodies) and thus, claim 53 as amended is not a substantial duplicate of claim 20. Claim 56 is analogous to claim 53, and is amended similarly herein. This amendment further limits the type of immune response elicited (IgG antibodies) and thus, claim 56 as amended is not a substantial duplicate of claim 44.

It is believed that these amendments fully address the objections to claims 22, 46, 53, and 56. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic interview prior to the preparation of any further written action.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Susan W. Graf/
Susan W. Graf, Ph.D.
Registration No. 60,432